REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated February 2, 2010. Claims 1–4, 7–8, and 11–24 are pending in the application. Claims 2–4, 7–8, and 11–24 have been withdrawn pursuant to a restriction requirement. Claim 1 has been amended. Claims 6 and 10 have been canceled without prejudice. The Examiner's reconsideration of the rejection in view of the amendment and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,978,029 to Ikeda (hereinafter "Ikeda") in view of U.S. Patent No. 2,610,252 to Fuller (hereinafter "Fuller").

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, "**a first bypass capacitor** connected in parallel between an output port of the amplification means and ground port to function as a filter; **a second bypass capacitor** connected parallel to the first bypass capacitor to perform an EM-noise-filtering and ESD-blocking function; and **a first decoupling resistor** connected serially between an output port of the first bypass capacitor and an output port of the second bypass capacitor to perform a decoupling function, **so that the EM-noise-filtering/ESD-blocking section has a shape of a character 'Π.'**" The Examiner concedes that Ikeda fails to show the second bypass capacitor and the first decoupling resistor. The Examiner further concedes that Ikeda fails to show the filtering/blocking section having a Π-shape.

The Examiner cites Fuller as showing a decoupling resistor as its resistor 64. However, the Examiner does not take into account the claimed *second bypass capacitor*. The Examiner points to capacitors 63 and 65 in Fuller as being the first and second bypass filters, but referring to Fuller, column 4, lines 20–25, it is clear that capacitor 65 is actually part of the *decoupling network* and cannot reasonably read on *either* of the bypass capacitors recited in claim 1. Instead,

resistor 64 and capacitor 65 form a general RC structure in the context of the rest of Fuller's FIG. 3. As such, Ikeda and/or Fuller, taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest a second bypass filter connected parallel to the first bypass capacitor to perform an EM-noise-filtering and ESD-blocking function or a decoupling resistor that is connected serially between an output port of the first bypass capacitor and an output port of the second bypass capacitor.

Furthermore, the Examiner has made no effort to show that either Ikeda or Fuller disclose or suggest a Π in the filtering/blocking section. In the past, the Examiner has asserted that "it is a matter of design choice how this section is shaped" (Office Action of 10/28/2008, p. 5). However, Applicants reaffirm and maintain that, as those skilled in the art are well aware, the difference between a parallel arrangement and a series arrangement in a circuit leads to substantial differences in the behavior of the circuit. The present claims recite a specific structural arrangement of capacitors and resistors, arranged so as to aid in the function of blocking and filtering in the context of the rest of the circuit.

By using two bypass capacitors and a decoupling capacitor in a Π-shape configuration, with the bypass capacitors between an amplifier and the ground, the present invention is able to bypass both low- and high-frequencies. The Π-shape therefore permits the present invention to filter a wide band. Neither Ikeda nor Fuller, whether considered alone or together, teach or suggest such a configuration, and neither reference performs the claimed functions. Applicants sincerely hope that this explains the structural and functional purpose of the Π-shape. This shape is not merely a "design choice," and is not made obvious by the cited art. If the Examiner wishes to discuss this point, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned to discuss.

For at least the above reasons, it is respectfully asserted that Ikeda and/or Fuller, taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest all of the elements of claim 1. It is therefore

believed that claim 1 is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the rejection is earnestly solicited.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all the claims now pending in the application are in condition for allowance. Early and favorable reconsideration of the case is respectfully requested.

The Office is authorized to charge a three-month extension fee of $555 to the applicant's representatives' Deposit Account No. 50-1433. It is believed that no additional fees or charges are currently due. However, in the event that any additional fees or charges are required at this time in connection with the application, they may be charged to applicant's representatives' Deposit Account No. 50-1433.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 3/2/10 By: _____

James J. Bitetto
Registration No. 40,513

Mailing Address:
TUTUNJIAN & BITETTO, P.C.
20 Crossways Park North, Suite 210
Woodbury, NY 11797
Tel: (516) 496-3868
Fax: (516) 496-3869